

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the final official action dated January 31, 2011, and notice of appeal mailed August 1, 2011 (received by U.S. Patent Office on August 5, 2011), in the above-referenced application. This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our credit card account in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 29610/CDT496.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-19, 33-39, and 42-45 are pending in this application, but claims 12-19, 33-39, 42, and 43 have been withdrawn.

By the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendment may be found throughout the application as filed, for example, at page 15 of the substitute specification (clean version) and Figure 6a. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 USC §112, 1ST PARAGRAPH

Claim 45 has been rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as assertedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In making this rejection, the examiner asserted that “the bank face angle in the specification is defined with respect to the base of the bank, while the claimed angle is defined with respect to the base of the well.”

In response, the applicants note that Figure 6a illustrates a situation where the bank face angle is defined as being 135° (i.e., greater than 90° as recited in claim 45), thereby providing an undercut bank face 610a overhanging the base of the well 608. *See* page 15 of the substitute specification (clean version). In view of the referenced application description, the applicants respectfully submit that the inventors were in possession of the subject matter of claim 45 as previously pending. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the bank face is “at an angle relative to an axis defined by the base of the well.”

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the written description rejection of claim 45.

35 USC §102/103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 44, and 45 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as assertedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0052120 to Gupta et al. (“Gupta”) or, in the alternative, as assertedly obvious over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,630,274 to Kiguchi et al. (“Kiguchi”).

In response, a declaration of co-inventor Julian Carter, Ph.D. pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131 (“the Rule 131 declaration”) is filed herewith. The Rule 131 declaration demonstrates that the methods of fabricating an organic light emitting diode device, as recited in the claims of the application, were reduced to practice before the September 9, 2003 filing date of U.S. Appl. Pub. 2005/0052120 to Gupta et al. (“Gupta”) and subsequent to December 31, 1995. Additionally, the Rule 131 declaration demonstrates the inventors’ possession of at least as much as is shown in Gupta before the September 9, 2003 filing date of Gupta and subsequent to December 31, 1995. As a result, the applicants respectfully submit that Gupta is not available as a reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-5, 9, 10, 13-18, and 20 as anticipated by Gupta or, in the alternative, as obvious over Gupta in view of Kiguchi have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, the examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

March 5, 2012

/Andrew M. Lawrence/
Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
Attorney for Applicants
6300 Willis Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300